10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

1	Eugene P. Ramirez, Esq. (State Bar No. 134865)
	Eugene P. Ramirez, Esq. (State Bar No. 134865) _eugene.ramirez@manningkass.com
2	Kayleigh A. Andersen (State Bar No. 306442) Kayleigh.Andersen@manningkass.com MANNING & KASS ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP 801 S. Figueroa St, 15 th Floor Los Angeles, California 90017-3012 Telephone: (213) 624-6900 Facsimile: (213) 624-6999
	Kayleigh.Andersen@manningkass.com
3	MANNING & KASS
	ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP
4	801 S. Figueroa St, 15 th Floor
	Los Angeles, California 90017-3012
5	Telephone: (213) 624-6900
	Facsimile: (213) 624-6999
6	
	Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF
7	Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO and
	CHRISTOPHER ALFRED
8	
9	UNITED STATES DISTI

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff,
v.

COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO and CHRISTOPHER ALFRED,
Defendants.

STEFFON BARBER, an individual,

Case No. 5:22-cv-00625-KK-DTB

[Assigned to the Honorable District Judge Kenly Kiya Kato, Magistrate Judge, David T. Bristow]

DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF ERRATA RE: EXHIBIT A TO OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 1 TO EXCLUDE EVIDENCE OF, ARGUMENT REGARDING, OR REFERENCES TO PLAINTIFF STEFFON BARBER'S CRIMINAL RECORD AND PRIOR BAD ACTS; DECLARATION OF KAYL EIGH A. ANDERSEN

Judge: Hon. Kenly Kiya Kato Date: January 8, 2026

Time: 10:30 å.m.

23

24

25

26

27

28

TO PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

Defendants COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO and CHRISTOPHER ALFRED attached incorrect exhibit A to the Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion in Limine No. 1 to Exclude Evidence of Argument Regarding, or references to Plaintiff Steffon Barber's Criminal Record and Prior Bad Acts: Declaration of Kayleigh A.

KASS	
NNING	
Ψ V	
>	

1	Andersen.		
2	Attached it the CORRECT	exhibit A to the Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion	
3	in Limine No. 1 to Exclude Evide	ence of Argument Regarding, or references to	
4	Plaintiff Steffon Barber's Criminal Record and Prior Bad Acts: Declaration of		
5	Kayleigh A. Andersen.		
6	DATED: December 19, 2025	MANNING & KASS	
7		ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP	
8			
9		By: /s/ Kayleigh A. Andersen	
10		Eugene P. Ramirez, Esq.	
11		Kayleigh A. Andersen, Esq. Attorneys for Defendants, COUNTY OF	
12		SAN BERNARDINO and	
13		CHRISTOPHER ALFRED	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
2627			
28			
ا ن∟	ii		

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

UNITED STATE	S DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIF	ORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION
STEFFON BARBER, an)
individual,)
Plaintiff,)))
vs.) Case No.) 5:22-cv-00625-KK-SHK
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO,)
a municipal entity, and)
DOES 1 THROUGH 10,)
inclusive,)
Defendant.)) _)

REMOTE DEPOSITION OF
STEFFON TODD BARBER
APPEARING REMOTELY VIA ZOOM

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025

Reported by: F. ELOIS DUNCAN CSR NO. 4066 Job No. 13309719



1	period talking about before 2014; is that fair?	9:30AM
2	A Yes, ma'am.	
3	Q Okay.	
4	Other than this current lawsuit, have you ever	
5	been a party to a lawsuit before?	9:30AM
6	A No.	
7	Q Prior to this incident, have you ever been	
8	convicted of a felony?	
9	A Yes.	
10	Q Okay.	9:31AM
11	How many times?	
12	A I can't I can't recall. More than once.	
13	Q Okay.	
14	Do you recall an incident in December of 2017	
15	that led to a four-year probation term?	9:31AM
16	MR. DIGGS: Well, objection to the extent it's not a	
17	conviction in discussing probation, as it's not	
18	admissible.	
19	But you can answer if you recall.	
20	THE WITNESS: I really don't recall.	9:31AM
21	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	
22	Q Do you recall at the time of this incident that	
23	you were on felony probation?	
24	MR. DIGGS: Same objection; lacks foundation.	
25	//	9:31AM

1	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	9:31AM
2	Q You can answer, Mr. Barber.	
3	A I can recall being on probation.	
4	Q Do you recall pleading guilty to a felony child	
5	abuse that led to the four-year probation term?	9:32AM
6	MR. DIGGS: Objection; vague as to scope and time;	
7	lacks foundation.	
8	You can answer.	
9	THE WITNESS: Yeah. Yeah, I do.	
10	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	9:32AM
11	Q Okay.	
12	Was that on your your daughter?	
13	A Yes.	
14	Q Okay.	
15	And that was the probation, the felony probation	9:32AM
16	that you were on at the time of this incident with the	
17	deputy; is that correct?	
18	A No.	
19	Q It wasn't? Was it a different felony probation?	
20	A It was a different felony probation.	9:32AM
21	Q Okay.	
22	What was that felony probation for that you were	
23	on at the time of this incident?	
24	A It was an assault, I believe. Assault on an	
25	officer if I remember correctly.	9:33AM

1	Q Okay.	9:33AM
2	Do you recall the date of the incident that led	
3	to that conviction and probation?	
4	A No.	
5	Q Okay.	9:33AM
6	Let's see how many times had you been	
7	arrested by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's Department	
8	prior to this incident?	
9	MR. DIGGS: Again, objection hold on hold on.	
10	Objection; that's not likely to lead to the admissibility	9:33AM
11	of the evidence to the extent you're just asking about	
12	arrest and not felony.	
13	But you may answer.	
14	THE WITNESS: Too many to remember.	
15	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	9:33AM
16	Q Would you say it was more than five times you	
17	have been arrested by the San Bernardino County Sheriff's	
18		
	Department prior to this incident?	
19	MR. DIGGS: Same objections; calls for speculation.	
19 20		9:34AM
	MR. DIGGS: Same objections; calls for speculation.	9:34AM
20	MR. DIGGS: Same objections; calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: It seems like every time they came	9:34AM
20 21	MR. DIGGS: Same objections; calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: It seems like every time they came out, whether I called or the neighbor called seems like	9:34AM
20 21 22	MR. DIGGS: Same objections; calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: It seems like every time they came out, whether I called or the neighbor called seems like whenever they were in the area, the neighbor called or	9:34AM
20 21 22 23	MR. DIGGS: Same objections; calls for speculation. THE WITNESS: It seems like every time they came out, whether I called or the neighbor called seems like whenever they were in the area, the neighbor called or anybody called, whenever the police came out, I went to	9:34AM 9:34AM

		1
1	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	9:34AM
2	Q Okay.	
3	And do you recall an arrest by the San	
4	Bernardino County Sheriff's Department on April 7th of	
5	2021? So about 20 days before this incident.	9:35AM
6	MR. DIGGS: Objection; that is not likely to lead to	
7	the admissibility of admissible evidence.	
8	But go ahead.	
9	THE WITNESS: That's what that's what I just	
10	mentioned. That's what I just mentioned now of the	9:35AM
11	assault.	
12	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	
13	Q Assault on a deputy; is that correct?	
14	A Yes.	
15	Q Okay.	9:35AM
16	Do you recall what the terms of your felony	
17	probation were at the time you had contact with the deputy	
18	on April 27th, 2021?	
19	A Can you say that can you say the	
20	Q Yeah.	9:35AM
21	Do you recall the terms? Like, the court reads	
22	your terms. You have a paper that tells you what your	
23	felony conditions are?	
24	A The felony conditions, yeah.	
25	Q Okay.	9:36AM

1	And do you recall one of them being consent to	9:36AM
2	law enforcement searches?	
3	A Yeah, I never refused law enforcement searches.	
4	The officer	
5	MR. DIGGS: No, no, no. There's no question,	9:36AM
6	Mr. Barber.	
7	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	
8	Q Thank you.	
9	I am asking specific questions. Just do your	
10	best to answer my questions and this process will be a lot	9:36AM
11	smoother so we're not all talking all over each other,	
12	okay?	
13	A Yeah.	
14	Q Okay.	
15	As a result of this incident on April 27th of	9:36AM
16	2021, you were found guilty of assault with a deadly	
17	weapon by a jury; is that correct?	
18	A Can you repeat the question.	
19	Q Of course.	
20	As a result of this incident on April 27th of	9:36AM
21	2021, the incident we're here to discuss, you were found	
22	guilty of assault with a deadly weapon by a jury; correct?	
23	A Yes, ma'am.	
24	Q Okay.	
25	And in that case the deputy, Deputy Alfred, was	9:37AM

1	the victim of the assault; correct?	9:37AM
2	A Yes.	
3	Q Was that a yes? I'm sorry.	
4	A Yes.	
5	Q Okay.	9:37AM
6	And as part of this criminal case arising from	
7	the incident, you were also found to be in violation of	
8	your probation terms; is that correct?	
9	A Yes.	
10	Q And that was because you failed to submit to the	9:37AM
11	law enforcement contact; is that correct?	
12	MR. DIGGS: Objection; calls for a legal conclusion.	
13	THE WITNESS: No. That was because because of	
14	the assault the assault in my terms and conditions, I	
15	believe. I never knew it was an officer. So I don't	9:37AM
16	think that violated my terms and conditions. I think they	
17	were actually assault	
18	BY MS. ANDERSEN:	
19	Q Were you present for the sentencing?	
20	A Yes.	9:38AM
21	Q Okay.	
22	Do you recall the court during sentencing saying	
23	that he, by a preponderance of the evidence, found that	
24	you knew Deputy Alfred was a deputy?	
25	A No. He said that he he believes that I	9:38AM